

**REMARKS**

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs.

**Drawings**

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

**New Claims**

By this Amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 1-22 and added new claims 23-45 to this application. It is believed that the new claims specifically set forth each element of Applicants' invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, it is improper to conclude that a disclosure is not enabling without considering all relevant factors, including the presence or absence of working examples. See, *e.g.*, pages 8-9 of the present specification. This alone should provide sufficient evidence that the application would enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention without undue experimentation. It should be noted that proof of enablement will be required only where adequate reasons are advanced by the examiner to establish that a person skilled in the art could not use the invention without undue experimentation. See, *e.g.*, *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 169 U.S.P.Q. 367 (CCPA 1971). The *Marzocchi* court held that a recitation in the specification "must" be taken as sufficient unless the PTO could advance "reasons or evidence" as to the untruthfulness of the assertion. Thus, if this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that, *e.g.*, a reference be provided that supports the contention that the claims are not enabled. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/720,065

**Summary**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicants' local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2006

By:



Bruce H. Troxell  
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC  
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404  
Falls Church, Virginia 22041  
Telephone: 703 575-2711  
Telefax: 703 575-2707